

REMARKS

This Amendment is made in response to the Office Action dated December 12, 2007. In the following the undersigned will respond by paragraph number as appears in the Outstanding Office Action.

Referring to Paragraph 1, Applicants have deleted the phrase “the and detector during a start-up” whereby the insertion of hazard can be made. Each of lines 2 and 3 have been amended to insert therein “hazard.” With respect to line 4, the undersigned finds no “hazard” and thus can not comply with the Examiner’s request. Thus, Applicants have amended claim 15 to the extent possible and has removed the informalities identified.

Referring to Paragraphs 2 and 3, Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of independent claim 15, from which claims 29-34 depend, as based on PCT Application AU95/00493 of Garrick et al. and request that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicants have amended by the recitation of disabling of the filtration of transient alarm detections during start-up or test, whilst leaving the detector otherwise operative. This feature has been found novel and inventive in the applicant’s corresponding European application, now about to be granted as EP 1579402B. Applicants intend to recite in claim 15 that the filtration function is selectively disabled; that is to say the remainder of the detector remains operative.

The above quoted recitation was taken from claim 19 and inserted into claim 15, and, as discussed in paragraph 7, was rejected as obvious over Garrick in view of US Patent No. 4,818,970 of Natale. Garrick admittedly discloses a detector configured to output an alarm when a hazard is detected, but the relevance which the Examiner attached to Natale is not understood. Natale does not disclose any filter operating on a hazard detection signal nor indeed anything

else. He does provide a time delay switch (column 5 lines 20-24), the precise function of which is not stated. If it is this switch which the Examiner contends is a “filter”, there is no means disclosed in Natale to disable just this switch during start-up. In particular, the passages in column 9 to which the Examiner refers appear to be irrelevant.

Indeed there is no discussion in Natale of start-up and test routines, so it is not apparent how adding Natale to Garrick can possibly teach the present invention.

In any event and contrary to the Examiner’s 35USC102 rejection of claim 15 as discussed in paragraph 4, Garrick does not disclose any means for modifying the behaviour of the detector during start-up or test. Garrick’s test routine consists merely of prompting the alarm part of the detector to sound an alarm for a predetermined period by providing it with a simulated hazard detection signal. The behaviour of the detector part of the system is not modified; it is merely temporarily over-ridden by the simulated signal.

Thus even if the time-delay switch feature of Natale were incorporated into Garrick, it would not be disabled during the test. It would merely be ignored by the alarm part of the system, which instead would be responding to the simulated detection condition.

We therefore submit that claim 15, as well as the remaining claims dependent therefrom, as amended clearly is not taught or hinted-at by the combination of Garrick and Natale. Any conclusion to the contrary is, we respectfully submit, hindsight based on the teaching of the present invention.

In view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections of all of the claims have been overcome and that this application should now be passed to issuance. If the

Examiner is usable to allow this application, he is requested to place a call to the undersigned to suggest those amendments whereby this application may be speedily prosecuted to issuance.

Dated: March 12, 2008

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
T (212) 790-9200

Respectfully submitted,



R. Lewis Gable
Reg. No. 22,479
Attorney of Record